

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application and for indicating that the application includes allowable claims. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-4 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Nishi in view of Noll.

Regarding claims 1-4, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2, 4 and 5. The Examiner indicated that claim 5 includes allowable subject matter. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable over Nishi in view of Noll. Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled. Claim 3 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 1 and, therefore, is also allowable.

Regarding claims 8-10, claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 9, 10 and 11/12. The Examiner indicated that claims 11 and 12 include allowable subject matter. Therefore, amended claim 8 is allowable over Nishi in view of Noll. Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishi in view of Noll in further view of Craig. Claim 14 depends from allowable claim 8 and, therefore, is also allowable.

Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishi in view of Noll in further view of Grimsrud. Claim 21 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 22, 23 and 24/25. The Examiner indicated that claims 24 and 25 include allowable subject matter. Therefore, amended claim 21 is allowable over Nishi in view of Noll in further view of Grimsrud. Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled.

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishi in view of Noll in further view of Grimsrud. Claim 33 has been canceled.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishi in view of Noll in further view of Craig, in further view of Grimsrud. Claim 27 depends from allowable claim 21 and, therefore, is also allowable.

Claim 20 is allowed.

Claims 5-7, 11-13, 15-19, 24-26 and 28-32 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Regarding claims 5-7, claim 5 has been canceled. Claims 6 and 7 have been written in independent form, without limitations directed to “a virtual channel.” The Examiner indicated in the Office action of **February 12, 2007** that such claims would be allowable.

Regarding claims 11-13, claims 11 and 12 have been canceled. Claim 13 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 8 and, therefore, is also allowable.

Regarding claims 15-19, said claims have been written in independent form without limitations directed to “virtual channels.” The Examiner indicated in the Office action of **February 12, 2007** that such claims would be allowable.

Regarding claims 24-26, claims 24 and 25 have been canceled. Claim 26 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 21 and, therefore, is also allowable.

Regarding claims 28-32, said claims depend from allowable claim 21 and, therefore, are also allowable.

New claim 34 has been added, which depends from allowed claim 20.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

Appln No. 10/049,479
Amendment dated July 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated May 17, 2007

application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34392.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

Date: July 26, 2007

By: Brad C Spencer
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700